

Applicant : Ajay P. Sravanapudi et al.
Serial No. : 09/800,509
Filed : March 8, 2001
Page : 8 of 8

Attorney's Docket No.: 16438-011001

REMARKS

In response to the Office Action dated December 20, 2005, Applicants are canceling claims 1-7, 9-13, 19-27, 36-38 and 42-45. Claim 8 had been canceled earlier. As such, claims 14-18, 28-35 and 39-41, which were found allowable in the Office Action, are pending. Together with this amendment, Applicants are submitting a Supplemental Information Disclosure Statement.

Dependent claim 29 is being amended to correct an informality. Particularly, the amendment clarifies that method claim 29 depends from the independent method claim 28.

In the Office Action, claims 1-7, 9-13, 19-26, 36-38 and 42-45 were rejected under § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Raman (5,748,186) in view of Weiss (6,313,734). This rejection is moot because Applicant is canceling claims 1-7, 9-13, 19-26, 36-38 and 42-45.


In the Office Action, claim 27 was rejected under § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Raman (5,748,186). This rejection is moot because Applicant is canceling claim 27.

Applicants are not conceding that the rejections of the canceled claims were correct.

Enclosed is a \$60.00 check for the Petition for Extension of Time fee. Please apply any other charges or credits to deposit account 06-1050.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: 4/20/06


J. Richard Soderberg
Reg. No. 43,352

Fish & Richardson P.C., P.A.
60 South Sixth Street
Suite 3300
Minneapolis, MN 55402
Telephone: (612) 335-5070
Facsimile: (612) 288-9696
60333075.doc